

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 4, 6, 7, 10 – 12, 14 – 23, and 30 - 32 are in the application. These claims have been rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement of 35 USC § 112. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **Patentability of the Claims**

In the office action, the Examiner states that the amendments previously made, which state that the identifier is replace “...*following each authorization...*” are not present in the specification and so lack support. In reply, applicant respectfully submits that this is, in fact, disclosed in the specification. The Examiner’s attention is directed to paragraph [0091] and paragraph [0093] of the published specification.

Paragraph [0091] refers to a process of authorization. For instance:

*“By inserting a transponder card ... or coming into close proximity with ... a reader/writer ...”*

Thus paragraph [0091] refers to each time the transponder card commences the authorization process. The remainder of the paragraph describes one particular process for authorization.

That paragraph ends with: *“Next, the unique identifier is decrypted and verified against the identity database with respect to pre-defined authorisation parameters.”*

Applicant thus respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that verification against an identity database with respect to pre-identified authorization parameters will clearly be a process for authorization. Thus, although the Examiner states *“...there is no mention in the specification or figures of ‘authorization’ or any variation thereof,”* in fact paragraph [0091] clearly shows a process for authorization.

Paragraph [0093] describes the effects of a positive result from the process of authorization described in paragraph [0091]. Specifically the paragraph states:

*“If a positive result is obtained, a new unique identifier will be generated by the security processor...”*

Thus the amendment made to claim 1 whereby the security processor replaces the identifier "...*following each authorization* ..." is clearly shown in paragraph [0093] a result that "*will*" occur as a result of the process of authorization described in paragraph [0091].

Since the amendment to claim 1 made previously is clearly supported by the specification as described above, applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 USC 112 should be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, applicant believes that all of the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance, and an early notification to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact applicant's attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted: Hancock Hughey LLP  
/pwh #31,169/ Patrick W. Hughey  
Registration No. 31,169; Tel. No. (503) 274-5455